DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 209 994 HE 014 557

AUTHOR Seldin, Clement A.
TITLE National Study of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges: Off Campus Inservice Activities.
PUB DATE 81
NOTE 34p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; *Extension Education; External Degree Programs; Higher Education; *Inservice Education; Land Grant Universities; Off Campus Facilities; *Outreach Programs; *Professional Continuing Education; Professional Development; Rewards; *Schools of Education; *State Universities; Workshops

ABSTRACT

Information concerning off-campus inservice activity (OCIA) at state universities and land grant colleges in the United States was surveyed. There was a 92.5 percent response rate to questionnaires sent to 107 deans of schools, colleges, and departments of education. Inservice activities were considered to be courses, workshops, needs assessments, and other technical assistance. Findings include the following: OCIA is a significant activity of schools of education; schools, human service agencies, government agencies, industry, business, and the military are OCIA clientele; off-campus degree and certification programs are a major thrust of OCIA; off-campus Ed.D. and Ph.D. programs are a significant element of OCIA; schools of education rely on many sources of financial support; the major motivation for OCIA is community service; most faculty active in OCIA are full-time, tenured faculty; faculty bargaining units (functioning in only 22.6 percent of state universities and land grant colleges surveyed) do not have major impact on OCIA; and most schools of education have one individual to coordinate OCIA. It is recommended that faculty active in OCIA must be appropriately rewarded by the school of education and the university, and that recognition at times of reappointment, promotion, and tenure is important. Such a system should recognize both credit bearing and noncredit bearing OCIA. Suggestions for awarding credit, scheduling and funding OCIA, and modifying residency requirements for doctoral study are offered. Advantages of CCIA for the student, the cooperating organization (school, human service agency), and the university are identified. A bibliography is appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED209994

National Study of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges

Off Campus Inservice Activities

Clement A. Seldin
Office of Program Planning and Development
School of Education
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Clement A. Seldin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTEH (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE 014 557

Table of Contents

List of Tables iii

Preface iv

Introduction 1

Procedure 6

Findings

A. Scope of OCIA 6

B. OCIA Faculty 10

C. Organization, Coordination and Assessment 14

D. OCIA Barriers 18

E. OCIA Enablers 21

Conclusions 23

Recommendations 24

References 28

List of Tables

1. Percent of School of Education Activity Directed Toward OCIA as Cited by School of Educatior Deans 7

2. Faculty Rewards for OCIA Involvement as Cited by School of Education Deans 10

3. Primary Motivators for OCIA as Cited by School of Education Deans 12

4. Percent of OCIA Faculty Who Are Full Time as Cited by School of Education Deans 13

5. Percent of OCIA Faculty Who Are Tenured as Cited by School of Education Deans 13

6. Credits Awarded for Most OCIA as Reported by School of Education Deans 16

7. Use of Independent Study in OCIA as Reported by School of Education Deans 17

8. Barriers to OCIA as Cited by Three or More School of Education Deans 18

9. Enablers of OCIA as Reported by Three or More School of Education Deans 21

Preface

A professional improvement leave is designed to enhance the professional growth and development of the staff member and have a corresponding benefit to the University. The staff member returns with new skills, knowledge and expertise.

With confidence, I state that my professional leave, focused on off campus inservice activities, was highly successful in terms of both objectives.

1) *Reading* -- I occupied considerable time reading relevant research and literature. Specifically, I read selected articles and chapters on inservice education, off campus inservice activities and educational change theory (see References).

2) *Writing* -- I wrote an article titled "Toward Community Based Inservice Education" which has been accepted for publication in England's Bulletin of Educational Research. The article details why many institutions of higher education have been unsuccessful in supporting quality off campus inservice activities and suggests a specific cooperative model which has proved to be successful.

3) *Research* -- Serving as the central core of my professional leave, I designed, conducted and analyzed a national survey of schools, colleges and departments of education at state universities and land grant colleges in the United States. A remarkably high response rate of 92.5% was achieved. The analysis of the data is documented in this report.

4) *Collaboration* -- My invitation to conduct my research study at Boston College working with Dr. Joseph J. Pedulla, Senior Research Associate, was indeed exciting. He and his colleagues are certainly equal to their excellent reputation. I have gained immeasurable knowledge regarding survey design, administration and analysis. A sincere thank you is extended to Dr. Pedulla and Dean Mary Griffin of the School of Education at Boston College.

Introduction

In increasing numbers, Schools of Education are conducting activities off campus with public and private school educators, human service personnel and others. These part-time students, who are full-time employed educators, are growing in number at remarkable speed. In fact, in 1972, for the first time, the number of part-time students (degree, non-degree and non-credit) equalled the number of full-time students at institutions of higher education in the United States (Gordon et al 1976).

Interest in part-time students has been apparent for more than fifty years. College course catalogues have contained many courses scheduled in the late afternoon and evening, as well as during the weekend periods. These learning opportunities have been conducted both on and off campus. However, degree programs serving students outside of the university's immediate local area were not readily available until the 1940's. The University of Maryland was one of the leaders when, in 1947, it established degree courses in the District of Columbia. In fact, this program expanded to sites in Europe and currently operates on four continents. Since the 1940's, the number of institutions operating off campus degree programs has swelled. This proliferation of off campus degree programs has resulted in a wave of criticism.

> Too often it [off campus education] means going to rented classrooms where part-time instructors teach substandard courses to students who have no access to libraries or other academic services. Usually there are no support services . . .
>
> (Maeroff, 1979)

Specifically, the State Education Department of New York has charged that off campus courses are riddled with problems.

1) Faculty -- The teaching staff of off campus courses is generally composed of part-time faculty who are "moonlighting." Their qualifications and credentials tend to be inferior to those of on campus, full-time faculty.
2) Curriculum -- As a rule, off campus programs offer fewer courses from which a student can select in order to address degree requirements. Thus, oftentimes, this limitation results in groups of students enrolling in the same series of courses. Individual needs are often sacrificed. Moreover, courses are generally poorly supervised and, in some cases, degree requirements are less rigorous than for on campus students.
3) Administration and Services -- As a consequence of the off campus location of these courses, access to the plethora of on campus resources is limited. Oftentimes, basic administration of off campus courses is minimal and off campus students tend to feel isolated and under supported.

As institutions of higher education struggle to modify programs in order to eliminate or at least lessen the inadequacies, many university educators stress the strengths of off campus inservice activities as they relate to the student, the cooperating organization (school, human service agency, etc.) and the university. For the student, advantages

are abundant.

1) Theory and practice are more closely blended.
2) The integrating of employment and university study tends to increase student interest and motivation.
3) Courses, workshops, activities are scheduled at convenient times and locations.
4) Major losses of income are averted as students can maintain a full-time employment simultaneously with their study.
5) As a consequence of items 1 through 3 above, there is minimal disruption to the student's personal/ family life.
6) Outcomes of participation in these off campus inservice activities include professional growth and revitalization.

There are numerous advantages to the cooperating organization when it actively supports its employees as participants in off campus inservice activity. For example, for the school which encourages a teacher's participation, advantages include the following:

1) It provides a way for employee growth and development which ultimately benefits the organization and the consumers of the organization's product, i.e., for schools, the students.
2) As a result of professional renewal, there is often organizational renewal. For example, a school in which numerous faculty are enrolled in off campus

inservice activities, tends to grow as an institution--more able to reach stated missions and goals.

3) A mutually important relationship is enhanced between the educational organization and the university.

4) Given the growth of the student and the organization, relations with the community at large are enhanced.

There are major advantages for the institution of higher education when it supports off campus inservice activities.

1) The isolationism often associated with institutions of higher education is reduced; the "ivory tower" perception is less frequently perceived.

2) University faculty can examine more effectively the extent to which theory is directly translated into practice.

3) This theory into practice examination provides fertile ground for faculty research.

4) This cooperative off campus activity is often looked upon favorably by external funding agencies.

5) Universities which gain reputations for quality off campus programs tend to attract other students. Application and enrollment are often increased.

6) If it is assumed that one mission of the university is to serve societal needs, and staff renewal in schools, human service agencies and elsewhere is a

demonstrated need of society, then universities do play an important role by supporting off campus inservice activities.

Without doubt, off campus inservice activities have both far reaching strengths and apparent weaknesses. I have attempted to document several of the elements which appear repeatedly in the professional research and literature and are suggested from my personal involvement in this area.

In the following pages, I will describe the national survey, provide data analysis, present conclusions and suggest recommendations.

Procedure

The questionnaire was sent to deans of schools, colleges and departments of education at state universities and land grant colleges in the United States. These institutions are members of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. Of the 107 deans who were mailed the questionnaire, 99 (92.5%) complied. Clearly, this is an exceptionally high rate of response which suggests the importance and crucial nature of off campus inservice activities at these institutions of higher education.

This researcher had intended to send three mailings; each with a cover letter and questionnaire. However, the first two mailings secured a 92.5% response and plans for the third mailing were abandoned. This, again, is symptomatic of the high value these deans placed on OCIA at their institutions.

The five page questionnaire was of original design. A working definition of OCIA was provided:

> Off-campus inservice activity (OCIA) refers to any of the following activities when conducted in an off-campus location where the faculty do not have primary assignment: courses, workshops, needs assessments and other technical assistance.

Respondents were asked to complete supply items where requested.

Findings

A. Scope of OCIA

It is clear that OCIA is considered a major thrust schools,

colleges and departments of education (hereafter called schools) at state universities and land grant colleges in the United States (hereafter called universities). As the dean of a southern university stated, "I endorse the concept very strongly. I am fascinated by the partnership arrangement with the State Department, LEAs, and IHEs." From a mid-western dean, OCIA "will be a major determinant of our quality as a graduate institution."

Table 1 illustrates the percent of school of education activity directed toward OCIA as reported by school of education deans.

Table 1

Percent of School of Education Activity
Directed Toward OCIA as Cited by
School of Education Deans

Percent of School Activity	Frequency (PCT)
0-5	15.1
6-10	24.3
11-20	35.6
21-40	18.4
41-80	4.4
81-100	2.2
	100.0

As illustrated in Table 1, 60.6% of the school of education deans indicated that more than 10% of their total school activity is devoted toward OCIA. And 25% of the deans indicated that more than 20% of their total school activity is focused in this area. This off campus activity, uncommon just thirty-five years ago, is now almost commonplace and indeed expanding. As the director of OCIA at a southeastern college

purported, "These services rendered are invaluable to our students. Plans are being made to expand our program."

The clientele for OCIA are varied and include: public schools (cited by 87 deans), human service agencies (cited by 66 deans), private schools (cited by 58 deans) and other colleges and universities (cited by 56 deans). In addition, several deans indicated off campus work with government agencies, industry and business, and the military. Given the sample for this study, it is not surprising that activities are most often directed toward public systems of education. It is interesting to note, however, the degree of collaboration with others.

Off campus activity can be as close as one mile from campus and as far as one hundred miles away or more. The majority of the schools of education conduct most of their off campus activity relatively close to home (fewer than one hundred miles away) although 40.6% of the deans reported that the between 5 and 10% of their OCIA is in excess of one hundred miles from campus. Geography often plays an important role. As one western dean responded. "Out here, to do anything, we have to travel a few hundred miles!"

Another area examined in this survey related to the specific type of off campus activity schools of education conduct. A major focus appears to be programs of study directed toward academic degrees or certificates as opposed to individual courses and workshops not linked to a degree program. In fact, half of the deans suggested that 50% or more of their off campus activity is directed toward degree programs and certificates. Other foci include: technical assistance with no

academic credit offered (3 of 4 deans indicated 30% or less of their OCIA) and courses or workshops not part of any degree or certification program although offering academic credit (5 of 10 deans reported that 25% or less of their OCIA in this category).

Off campus work is focused on several academic levels including undergraduate education, and Master's, CAGS, Ed.D., and Ph.D. as well as numerous certifications. The most often reported levels, however, were the Master's (indicated by 83 deans) and certification (indicated by 60 deans). A high number of deans reported OCIA directed toward the CAGS (21), Ed.D. (28) and Ph.D. (20). In virtually all cases of OCIA directed toward the doctorate, a residency requirement was mandated.

The funding required to support OCIA comes from numerous sources, some external, others internal. The following indicates the origin of support and the number of deans citing this category as funding their OCIA: specific allocation of non personnel budget (28), federal grants (40), foundation grants (15), university/college assignment of regular full-time faculty on load (65) and student tuition and/or fee (77). The relatively high reliance on a number of funding sources may suggest that OCIA cannot rely on anyone for total support.

When asked how many years their school has been active in OCIA, 77.4% of the deans responded more than 12 years. Another 7.5% reported OCIA for the past 8-12 years; while 7.5% indicated the past 4-8 years. Only 4.3% of the deans claimed active off campus activities beginning in the past 0-4 years (3.2% did not respond to the question).

B. OCIA Faculty

Perhaps the area of most interest to the deans of the schools of education responding to this survey was the faculty reward systems supporting OCIA. Most of the survey comments suggested that faculty reward systems need an immediate overhaul because they are simply inappropriate and insufficient. Selected comments are included later in this report under the topic of *Barriers to OCIA.*

Table 2

Faculty Rewards for OCIA Involvement as Cited by School of Education Deans

Reward	Frequency
Additional compensation	77
Reduced on campus teaching load	52
Use of state vehicles	33
OCIA considered important in terms of:	
Reappointment	31
Promotion	38
Tenure	31

As illustrated in Table 2, additional compensation for OCIA was cited most frequently by school of education deans (77). However, in some cases, compensation would only be allocated on an overload basis. Many schools established an "overload salary schedule" which provided the smallest compensation to instructors and the highest to "full professors." Other schools offered a flat 10% of a faculty member's academic salary for each three credit off campus course taught on an overload basis. One mid-western school provided faculty a choice,

either $480.00 per credit hour off campus or reduced on campus load.

Reduction in on campus teaching load was reported by 53 deans as a faculty reward. For many of these schools, one off campus course reduced one's on campus load by one course. However, two deans stated that one off campus credit is equivalent to 1.5 on campus credits in terms of faculty load. Use of university/state vehicles was also cited as a reward by 33 deans.

The deans were asked further whether OCIA is considered important in terms of reappointment, promotion and tenure. Table 2 illustrates a relatively high rate of response in all three categories. Yet, several comments such as the following, from a mid-western dean, make these figures somewhat questionable in terms of their interpretation. "In terms of reappointment, tenure and promotion--on paper--OCIA makes a difference. The harsh reality is that it really doesn't."

What does motivate faculty members to venture off campus in OCIA involvements? As indicated clearly in Table 3, community service and generating credit hours were cited the most frequently as primary motivators of OCIA (reported by 64 and 32 school of education deans respectively). Other motivators include state directives (12), creating sites for research (4), creating sites for interns (9) and generating additional funds (7).

Table 3

Primary Motivators for OCIA as Cited by School of Education Deans

Motivation	Frequency
Community service	64
Generate credit hours	32
State directive	12
Create sites for research	4
Create sites for interns	9
Generate additional funds	7

The vast majority of the sample schools of education (86%) have a separate organizational unit of continuing education. Many of these schools (45.2%) do not allow faculty to teach through this division of continuing education as part of their regular teaching load. Yet, another 37.6% of the deans indicated that faculty can teach at their schools through continuing education as part of their regular teaching assignment (9.7% left the question blank and 7.5% circled both "yes" and "no"). Competition between schools of education and divisions of continuing education was described by one southwestern dean, "We are in direct competition with CE and under no circumstances will I encourage my faculty to teach through CE as part of load."

As documented earlier, one of the major problems associated traditionally with OCIA concerns the OCIA faculty who are perceived as part-time and with inferior credentials and qualifications when contrasted to full-time faculty. The data in Table 4 suggests a very different picture.

Table 4

Percent of OCIA Faculty Who Are Full Time
as Cited by School of Education Deans

Percent of Full Time Faculty	Frequency (PCT)
0-20	7.7
21-40	3.3
41-60	6.6
61-80	13.2
81-100	69.2
	100.0

Clearly, the vast majority of faculty who are active in OCIA are full time, not part-time. Almost 7 of 10 deans (69.2%) claimed that more than 80% of their OCIA faculty are full time.

Interestingly, most of the OCIA faculty are not junior faculty members without tenure, but rather tenured senior members (see Table 5).

Table 5

Percent of OCIA Faculty Who Are Tenured
as Cited by School of Education Deans

Percent of Tenured Faculty	Frequency (PCT)
0-20	5.6
21-40	7.7
41-60	22.3
61-80	42.2
81-100	22.2
	100.0

More than 6 of 10 school of education deans (64.4%) indicated that better than 60% of OCIA faculty are tenured. Another survey question

revealed that 6 of 10 deans (63.3%) reported that more than 60% of their entire faculty was tenured. It can be concluded that in most schools of education, the number of tenured faculty active in OCIA is directly proportional to the total number of tenured faculty in the entire school.

Finally, it was questioned whether a faculty bargaining unit might influence OCIA. In fact, 77.4% of the school of education deans reported that their faculty do not belong to such a unit. For those deans functioning with a bargaining unit, most indicated that the unit has, as one northwestern dean exclaimed, "absolutely little or no effect on us here in terms of our off campus work."

C. Organization, Coordination and Assessment

It was assumed that virtually all schools of education would have one individual responsible to coordinate OCIA and that OCIA would be evaluated at several stages of operation, i.e., initial proposal, annually and at the conclusion of activity. The survey indicates that 76.3% of the deans have an official OCIA coordinator. In the vast majority of cases, these coordinators are deans and directors with faculty appointments at at least the associate professor level. Titles such as Director of Field Services, Assistant Dean for Off Campus Affairs and Associate Dean for Inservice Education are common.

Academic assessment of OCIA is generally the responsibility of a number of individuals including the director, the dean of the school of education and, in some cases, the graduate school as well.

In order to support off campus activities, many schools charge students either higher tuition than charge on campus students (indicated by 38.7% of the education deans) or higher fees (reported by 44.1%). Generally, the additional funds ranged from 10 to 20 dollars per credit. Thus, an off campus student could pay as much as $60.00 more for a 3 credit course than an on campus student.

Interestingly, academic quality assessment occurs most often at the initial proposal stage and at the conclusion of the activity (each cited by 45.9% of the education deans). Annual assessment is, indeed, a less frequent procedure occurring in approximately 1 in 4 schools (26.5%). Therefore, in most cases, once the program or activity is implemented, formal assessment does not again occur until termination.

It was hypothesized that many schools would encourage course/workshop scheduling independent of the university calendar. The survey revealed that in 44.1% of the schools of education, scheduling is independent of the university calendar. Yet, in the same number of schools (44.1%), a conforming schedule is functioning (11.9% did not answer the question). Supporting an independent scheduling procedure, one southeastern dean of education states, "If we couldn't have independent scheduling for our OCIA, we couldn't support the good work we do!"

Given the assumption that addressing the needs and concerns of practicing educators through OCIA often requires creative scheduling, innovative approaches and procedures, one might assume that such off campus activities would require a variable credit approach. School of

education deans were asked to indicate the number of credits offered for most of their OCIA (course/workshop). Table 6 reflects a different picture from the one assumed. Clearly, three credit offerings are most frequently awarded for OCIA as reported by 69.9% of the education deans.

Table 6

Credits Awarded for Most OCIA as Reported by School of Education Deans

Credit	Frequency (PCT)
No credit	5.4
One credit	4.3
Two credits	3.2
Three credits	69.9
More than three	4.3
Circled more than one answer	9.7
Did not respond	3.2
	100.0

Another survey question which yielded surprising data was the use of independent study (tutorials) in OCIA. Given the individual nature of inservice education, it was assumed that many schools would encourage students to pursue their inservice education through the use of independent projects that would not, of necessity, be linked to formal course work. However, as illustrated in Table 7, almost 3 of 4 deans (73.1%) reported either no use or rare use of independent studies. Only 4.3% indicated extensive use of such tutorials.

Table 7

Use of Independent Study in OCIA as Reported by School of Education Deans

Use	Frequency (PCT)
Extensive	4.3
Moderate	19.4
Rare	47.3
No	25.8
Did not answer	3.2
	100.0

As stated previously, one of the major motivations for OCIA is generating credit hours (cited by 32 education deans as a primary motivator--see Table 3). Therefore, one can hypothesize that non-credit bearing OCIA would not be factored highly into a faculty member's teaching load. The survey supported this hypothesis as 78.5% of the education deans claimed that teaching load does not take into account any non-credit bearing activity.

Finally, deans were asked what resources are commonly used to support their OCIA. Media hardware (cited by 82 deans) and media software (reported by 84 deans) were understandably of high usage. Of special interest was the high rate of use of off campus book libraries (reported by 83 education deans). As one mid-western college dean states, "We certainly can't bring the students to our library so we must bring the library to them--at our off campus center." Additionally, telephone system equipment such as conference calls are commonly used (reported by 21 school of education deans).

D. OCIA Barriers

Deans were asked to identify the two greatest barriers to growth of their OCIA. The answers were revealing and provided an unusual picture of the numerous major roadblocks. Table 8 provides a listing of barriers with a corresponding frequency count. The barriers identified by education deans were categorized into the seven areas identified in Table 8.

Table 8

Barriers to OCIA as Cited by Three or More School of Education Deans

Barrier	Frequency
Poor faculty reward system	23
Limited funding	28
State board or agency limitations	14
University limitations	8
Competition from other universities	5
Can't meet demand	8
No OCIA director	3

As illustrated in Table 8, limited funding poses the major barrier to OCIA growth (cited by 28 education deans). States one northwestern dean, "We just don't have sufficient funding to support our OCIA and I'm not sure if we ever will."

Poor faculty rewards were cited by 23 education deans as a major OCIA barrier. A candid comment from a southwestern dean, "Currently the university rewards faculty for research, not for OCIA." From another southwestern dean, "By taking the time it [OCIA] does, it may indirectly detract from ability of faculty member to come up with the

publication and research necessary for promotion and tenure." Several deans indicated that the "publish or perish" guideline is the rule at their institutions of higher education.

Interestingly, a relatively large number of education deans (14) reported that there are state board or state agency limitations and restrictions guiding their school's OCIA. States a southeastern dean, "Our activities have been greatly decreased because of state regulations during the past two years." From a northwestern dean, "Until legislature recognizes its worth [OCIA], it's a losing proposition." In a southeastern state, the state imposes geographic limitations on university directed OCIA by "assigned OCIA territory" states a dean.

Numerous university limitations were identified by 8 education deans as obstacles to OCIA. In one western state, the university equates OCIA with consulting and, states the dean, "Only one day in six may be spent in OCIA or consulting." A southeastern dean identified another university limitation, "OCIA credits do not count toward FTE." Similarly, another southeastern dean reports the "inability to include full percent of off-campus credit hours produced in the state formula for funding institutions. (It is at 70% level.)" Without university support, many schools are encouraged and rewarded for staying on campus.

In some cases, competition from other educational institutions is perceived as a major barrier to OCIA growth (indicated by 5 deans). For example, a mid-western dean states that a major barrier is "degree

programs (on site) of lower standards offered by other institutions."

Several deans (8) indicated that they are unable to meet the demand for OCIA from agencies, schools and organizations. A northeast dean states that the "volume of demand is greater than our capacity." From a southwestern dean, "We simply don't have sufficient faculty to meet the weekly requests for quality OCIA."

Finally, three education deans indicate a lack of a "full-time director" as a major barrier. Not indicated in Table 8 is a concern of two deans that their faculty simply do not understand the need for a commitment to OCIA. From a southeastern director of OCIA,

> Without it [OCIA], and the bloody hard work to convince faculty it should be done, we'd almost be out of business. It is one of our . . . major achievements but is not much appreciated, and probably least so by those whose jobs [we've] saved in the process.

Other barriers, cited by fewer than 3 deans, include the following:

1) poor off campus facilities
2) faculty who are "biased by on campus orientation to instruction/service"
3) distance
4) worn-out faculty
5) energy costs

E. OCIA Enablers

Education deans were asked to identify what they have done in the past five years to enable them to further develop OCIA. Their responses provide an overview of important facilitators of off campus work. Table 9 illustrates the enablers with a corresponding frequency count (the number of deans responding in this category).

Table 9

Enablers of OCIA as Reported by
Three or More School of Education Deans

Enabler	Frequency
Established OCIA office and named director	11
Identified and developed off campus center	7
Secured external funding	10
Maintained high academic quality	3
Established standing faculty committees on inservice	4
Worked closely with local administrators and agencies	4
OCIA--part of job description	4
Increased faculty rewards	8
Support off campus programs, not isolated courses	3
Established higher tuition and/or fees for OCIA	4

As illustrated in Table 9, the most frequently named enabler (cited by 11 education deans) was the establishing of an OCIA office and the naming of the director. This director is charged with the designing and implementing of support procedures and policy for off campus work.

A northeastern dean summarizes,

> We have reached an agreement with approximately 25 school systems to "broker" their inservice education needs. We have assigned a full-time program director with university funds who assists with needs assessment, matches resources with needs and performs an evaluation function . . . works well. We have approved a set of policies and procedures governing the awarding of academic credit for OCIA.

Securing external funding was cited by 10 education deans as an important enabler. As one southwestern dean purports, "It [grants] is the name of the game!"

Off campus centers for inservice activity were reported by 7 education deans as enabling policy. Commonly, enrollment in courses taught at these centers satisfies any university residency requirement for graduate work. Many centers contain instructional libraries, computer resources and other support resources.

One of the most interesting enablers is establishing OCIA as an integral part of a faculty member's job description (cited by 4 education deans). A southeastern dean stressed that faculty "have no choice--is institutional policy."

Increasing faculty rewards was reported by 8 education deans as an important enabler. In most cases, these rewards are monetary in nature.

Other enablers include the following: maintained high academic quality (3); established standing faculty committees on inservice (4); worked closely with local administrators and agencies (4); support off campus programs rather than isolated courses and workshops (3); and established higher tuition and/or fees for OCIA (4).

Conclusions

1) OCIA is a significant activity of schools of education at state universities and land grant colleges in the United States.

2) Schools, human service agencies, government agencies, industry, business and the military are OCIA clientele.

3) Off campus degree and certification programs are a major thrust of OCIA.

4) Off campus Ed.D. and Ph.D. programs are a significant element of OCIA.

5) Schools of education rely on many sources of financial support for OCIA including: non personnel budget, assignment of regular full-time faculty on load and tuition and/or fee surcharges.

6) The major motivation for OCIA is community service.

7) Most faculty active in OCIA are full-time faculty.

8) Most faculty active in OCIA are tenured.

9) Faculty bargaining units (functioning in only 22.6% of state universities and land grant colleges surveyed) do not have major impact on OCIA.

10) Most schools of education have one individual to coordinate OCIA (usually a dean or director with faculty appointment at associate professor or professor level).

11) Academic assessment of OCIA generally occurs at initial proposal stage and conclusion of activity. Annual assessment is significantly less frequent.

12) Approximately half of the deans reported that OCIA scheduling was generally independent of the university calendar.

13) The traditional three credit learning experience is most frequently used in OCIA.

14) Non credit bearing OCIA is generally not factored into teaching load.

15) Many schools of education establish off campus centers complete with media equipment, resource libraries, computer access and conference call capability.

16) The three major "barriers" to OCIA most frequently cited by school of education deans are: poor faculty reward systems, limited funding and state board or state agency limitations.

17) The three major "enablers" to OCIA most frequently cited by school of education deans are: the establishment of OCIA office and appointment of director, securing of external funding and increasing faculty rewards.

Recommendations

1) Faculty rewards

Faculty active in OCIA must be appropriately rewarded by the school of education and the university. Most important is recognition at times of reappointment, promotion and tenure. Every faculty member should be expected to actively contribute to OCIA as an integral part of their faculty responsibilities. Involvement must not be considered as a supplement to regular faculty loads; nor pursued only on an "overload

basis." Serious consideration should be given to the "one credit off campus equals one-and-a-half credits on campus" formula. Moreover, participation in OCIA should be written into all new faculty job descriptions.

Non credit bearing OCIA should be recognized as a legitimate activity of university faculty. Consideration should be given to building into faculty load room for non credit bearing activity using the same formula with which credit bearing experiences are calculated, i.e., one credit is equivalent to 14.5 contact hours. Thus, a faculty member who devotes fifteen hours during the semester to assist a school system develop a new social studies curriculum could reduce his/her teaching load by one credit. Clearly, the legitimacy of this activity must be recognized by school and university personnel committees. A revised faculty reward system which includes recognition for both credit bearing and non credit bearing OCIA, as outlined, must be documented.

2) Funding

Given the state of the economy, it is probably safe to assume that there will not be a major infusion of funds by the university into OCIA in the immediate future. Therefore, schools of education must continue to rely on several funding sources. Cooperative grant writing (university faculty and OCIA clientele) should be encouraged. It is mutually benefitting.

Many schools impose a surcharge of ten to twenty dollars per credit for students enrolled in off campus courses. These funds are used to cover the numerous travel expenses incurred by university faculty active

in OCIA. Consideration should be given to imposing a similar surcharge at our School of Education. These funds would also go to support non credit bearing OCIA in which the client is unable or unwilling to cover travel expenses.

A more ample fee reduction for off campus courses would offset this surcharge. Currently, the University of Massachusetts fee reduction for off campus courses is set at $33.00.

3) Credits

The survey revealed that the vast majority of credit bearing OCIA is organized into three credit offerings. Given the clientele and their particular inservice needs, schedules and interests, consideration should be given to increased variable credit activity. An off campus course in which a student can enroll for one to three credits, for example, may be more appropriate. Of course, criteria for evaluation would correspond to the number of credits for which the student enrolls.

4) Residency Requirement

OCIA at the doctoral level generally requires a one year residency. At the University of Massachusetts, there is a "two consecutive semester in full-time study" rule. At many other institutions of higher education, residency can include a summer semester. Consideration should be given to including a summer/fall or fall/summer sequence as a satisfactory completion of the residency requirement. Practicing educators, particularly teachers, may find this approach more realistic in terms of their needs, yet it still would address the advantages of a residency requirement for doctoral study.

5) Coordination

The survey revealed that most of the deans of education (76.3%) have official OCIA coordinators who are generally deans and directors with faculty appointments at at least the associate professor level. Titles of these coordinators include Director of Field Services and Assistant Dean for Off Campus Affairs. At our School of Education, an Associate Dean for Program Planning and Development and his Lecturer/ Staff Associate are the key figures of OCIA coordination. However, numerous other responsibilities of both individuals preclude a more systematic, full-time approach to OCIA coordination. Serious discussion is suggested to carefully analyze how OCIA can be best supported and coordinated at the School of Education, University of Massachusetts.

Annual assessment of OCIA is infrequent. Our School does not require any such assessment. If clear and realistic, such an annual review can be highly useful in documenting growth and determining next steps for OCIA.

Half of the deans of education responding indicated that their school's OCIA operates generally independently of the university calendar. Our OCIA conforms to the University of Massachusetts calendar. We can more effectively support our off campus involvement with a more flexible approach to scheduling. It is recommended that this arrangement be seriously explored.

Off campus inservice activity at schools of education is a vital element. We must continue to seek dynamic ways to effectively support this important work.

References

Asher, James J. "Inservice Education--Psychological Perspectives." San Francisco, California: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1967. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 015 891)

Brimm, Jack L., and Tollett, Daniel J. "How Do Teachers Feel About In-Service Education." Educational Leadership/Research Supplement, March, 1974.

Cooperative Education Association. A Directory of Cooperative Education. (Vol. V). Philadelphia: Author, 1977.

Edelfelt, Roy A. "Inservice Education of Teachers: Priority for the Next Decade." Journal of Teacher Education, Fall, 1974.

Edelfelt, Roy A., and Johnson, Margo (Eds.). "Rethinking Inservice Education." Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975.

Gordon, Linda W., and Schub, Judy H. (Eds.). On Campus/Off Campus Degree Programs for Part Time Students. Washington, D.C.: National University Extension, 1976.

Havelock, R.G. The Change Agents' Guide to Innovation in Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications, 1973.

Herriott, Robert E., and Gross, Neal (Eds.). The Dynamics of Planned Educational Change. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1979.

Lawrence, G., et al. "Patterns of Effective In-Service Education: A State of the Art Summary of Research on Materials and Procedures for Changing Behaviors in In-Service Education." State of Florida: Department of Education, December, 1974.

Maeroff, Gene I. "Off Campus Education is All Over the Lot." The New York Times, December 16, 1979.

Olson, Allan L. "Can We Individualize Inservice Education of Teachers?" Educational Technology, November, 1974.

Rubin, Louis (Ed.). Improving In-Service Education: Proposals and Procedures for Change. Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.

Rubin, Louis (Ed.). The In-Service Education of Teachers. Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1978.